REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

Claims 1, 16, 24, and 26-29 have been amended. Claims 30-39 have been added. No claims have been canceled. Hence, Claims 1-39 are pending in the application.

I.   APPLICANTS' STATEMENT OF INTERVIEW

The Examiner is thanked for extending the courtesy of a telephone interview on March 29, 2006. Applicants' representatives Christopher J. Palermo and Stoycho D. Draganoff, and Examiner Kristie D. Shingles participated in the interview. The claims discussed were Claims 1 and 16. The reference discussed was Benfield et al., U.S. Patent Application Serial No. US 2003/0009551 ("BENFIELD"). Agreement regarding patentability was not reached.

The Applicants pointed out that the feature of Claims 1 and 16 of a particular protocol that does not support translated ports for requesting network resources is not described or suggested by BENFIELD. The Examiner agreed that at least this feature distinguishes the claims over BENFIELD and the other references cited in the Office Action, but indicated that an updated search would be required.

II.   INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

Claim 1 has been rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over BENFIELD in view of March et al., U.S. Patent Application No. US 2003/0007486 ("MARCH"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In general, BENFIELD describes a distributed data processing system in which resources are dynamically discovered and in which discovered resources are adaptively monitored using a network management framework. When the network management framework detects that certain components within the framework may have failed, new instances of these components are started. (Paragraph [0014].) In BENFIELD, an IP Object Persistence (IPOP) service "is

15

Attorney Docket No.: 50325-0589

implemented as a collection of software components **for discovering, i.e. detecting**, IP 'objects',

i.e. **IP systems and IP endpoints by using physical network connections**." (Paragraph [0076],

emphasis added.) Thus, BENFIELD <u>detects</u> devices that have been assigned IP addresses in a

network for the purpose of creating topology of the network. (Paragraph [0076].)

This discovery, or detection, of device IP addresses is repeated and re-iterated in

numerous paragraphs of BENFIELD. For example, see paragraph [0078] (persistent repository

of information about discovered and monitored IP objects); paragraph [0080] (network discovery

engine); paragraph [0081] (discovering and monitoring IP objects); paragraph [0086] (a network

discovery engine driver discovering ranges of IP addresses in a scope defined by a subnet

address and subnet mask); paragraph [0091] (discovery of IP objects through routers and multi-

homed systems); paragraph [0097] (discovery of IP objects is based on physical network

connections).

In contrast to BENFIELD, in Claim 1 an intermediate device (which connects a first

network to a second network) determines whether a first received packet includes a first message

that <u>registers a resource,</u> which is available on a first device in the first network, <u>with a protocol</u>

<u>server for a particular protocol</u>. The protocol server is available at a second device on the second

network and is configured to register unique names for resources provided by devices on the

second network according to the particular protocol, which protocol does not support translated

ports for requesting network resources. If the intermediate device (such as, for example, a router

or a switch) determines that the first packet includes the first message, the intermediate device

determines a first information (e.g. a resource name) in the first message for uniquely requesting

the first resource, and stores data in a data structure indicating that the first information is

associated with the address of the first device on the first network.

Attorney Docket No.: 50325-0589

In Claim 1, information about a first device on a first network and a resource provided by the first device is stored **in response to a message which the first device sends to a second device** to **register the resource with a protocol server** running on the second device. In contrast, as discussed above, the system in BENFIELD employs a network discovery engine of distributed IP drivers to detect, or discover, devices that are assigned IP addresses in a network based on the physical network connections within the network.

Discovery of devices based on physical network connections is completely different than storing information based on a received message which intends to register a resource according to a protocol that does not support translated ports. Thus, BENFIELD does not teach or describe the subject matter of Claims 1. Furthermore, the other references cited in the Office Action do not teach or describe that subject matter.

For these reasons, BENFIELD and MARCH, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all features of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over BENFIELD in view of MARCH. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 are respectfully requested.

III.   INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 26, 28, AND 29

Independent Claims 26, 28, and 29 have been rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over BENFIELD in view of MARCH.

Claims 26, 28, and 29 include features similar to the features of Claim 1 discussed above. For this reason, Claims 26, 28, and 29 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over BENFIELD in view of MARCH for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 26, 28, and 29 are respectfully requested.

IV.   INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 16 AND 27

Independent Claims 16 and 27 have been rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35

Attorney Docket No.: 50325-0589

U.S.C. § 103(a) over BENFIELD in view of MARCH.

Claims 16 and 27 include features similar to the features of Claim 1 discussed above. For this reason, Claims 16 and 27 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over BENFIELD in view of MARCH for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 16 and 27 are respectfully requested.

V.   DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-15 AND 17-25

Claims 2-7, 13-14, 17-19, and 22-24 have been rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over BENFIELD in view of MARCH. Claims 8-12, 15, 20-21, and 25 have been rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over BENFIELD in view of MARCH and further in view of Gurijala et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,601,090 ("GURIJALA").

Claims 2-15 and 17-25 depend from independent Claims 1 and 16, respectively, and thus include each and every feature of the corresponding base claim. Furthermore, in rejecting Claims 8-12, 15, 20-21, and 25 the Office Action relies explicitly on BENFIELD and MARCH, and not on GURIJALA, to show the features discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 16. Because BENFIELD and MARCH, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach the subject matter of Claims 1 and 16, any combination of BENFIELD and MARCH with GURIJALA necessarily fails to teach the complete combination recited in any claim that depends from Claims 1 or 16. Thus, each of Claims 2-15 and 17-25 is allowable for at least the reasons given above for Claims 1 and 16.

In addition, each of Claims 2-15 and 17-25 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-15 and 17-25 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1 and 16.

Attorney Docket No.: 50325-0589

VI.   NEW CLAIMS 30-39

New Claims 30-34 and 35-39 depend from independent Claims 28 and 29, respectively, and thus include each and every feature of the corresponding base claim. Therefore, each of Claims 30-34 and 35-39 is allowable for at least the reasons given above for Claims 28 and 29.

In addition, each of Claims 30-39 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 30-39 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 28 and 29.

VII.   CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed. Further, for the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firms check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

19

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: April 7, 2006

Stoycho D. Draganoff
Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California   95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

20